

## The Sun

SATURDAY, JUNE 9, 1883.

Subscription by Mail—Post-paid.  
 DAILY, Per Month, \$1.00  
 DAILY, Per Year, \$10.00  
 SUNDAY, Per Year, \$1.00  
 DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year, \$11.00  
 WEEKLY, Per Year, \$4.00  
 Postage to Foreign Countries added.  
 THE SUN, New York City.

Advertising Rates.  
 Daily, per line, 10 cents; for ordinary advertising, 5 cents; for large type, 10 cents; for preferred position, 25 cents; for extra large type, 50 cents; for extra large type, 75 cents; for extra large type, 1.00.  
 Weekly, per line, 10 cents; for ordinary advertising, 5 cents; for large type, 10 cents; for preferred position, 25 cents; for extra large type, 50 cents; for extra large type, 75 cents; for extra large type, 1.00.

## This Will Not Do.

We have received copies of some of the baddest, made of silk and alleged to be issued in the Democratic interest. One of them represents the masculine ponderosity of Mr. CLEVELAND, the other the feminine loveliness of Mrs. CLEVELAND; and under her name is the inscription: "Queen of six millions of free people."

These badges are very beautifully embroidered, but they won't do. Each one of them bears evidence that it was made by THOMAS STEVENS of Coventry, England. That is enough. We don't want any English in our.

The same thing must be said about the red bandannas which are flourished so universally in honor of glorious old THURMAN. It appears that, while cotton ones are manufactured in abundance in America, silk ones are only made in Great Britain.

THURMAN is a genuine American, a Buckeye of uncontaminated Yankee stock; and in electioneering for him anybody waves a bandanna that was not made in America, he does dishonor and not honor to the great and gallant veteran.

Away with English badges and English bandannas! The Stars and Stripes are good enough for Democratic voters.

## Interesting Facts About the Platform.

An interview with the Hon. W. L. SCOTT, reported from St. Louis to the New York Tribune, contains what is certainly the most remarkable and perhaps the most important piece of news published since the present moon was young. After the Convention had adjourned the reporter found Mr. SCOTT in a state of happiness bordering on exultation. His "broad smile extended over his features," and he remarked to the Tribune correspondent:

"Well, it all turned out just as it was planned; the nomination, the platform, everything included. Not a single thing missed."

"I brought out that platform myself. Not a word of it, not the dotting of an 'i' was changed. It was adopted just as it was approved by the Convention."

Mr. SCOTT was not a member of the Committee on Resolutions, over whose protracted deliberations the Hon. HENRY WATTESSON presided with such graceful dignity. He was a powerful man of his native force, not only on account of his native force, but because of his persuasive ability of speech, but he was generally understood that he represented in St. Louis the private and personal wishes of Mr. CLEVELAND. If Mr. SCOTT is correctly reported in the Tribune, he now declares, in the frankness of his joy, that the platform reported by the Committee on Resolutions and adopted by the Convention had been prepared in advance in Washington and approved by the President. Mr. SCOTT conveyed it from the White House to St. Louis; and the only function of Mr. WATTESSON's committee was to pass the document along to the Convention.

This would mean that Mr. CLEVELAND has essentially modified his views of the propriety of forcing the tariff issue, as his free trade friends under that issue, during the canvass, sought to begin. For while the tariff part of the platform is so framed that the free traders, by putting their own construction upon its vague phrases, may derive satisfaction therefrom, it nevertheless takes a long step backward from the position assumed in Mr. CLEVELAND's message. The departure is from the specific to the general, and that is always retrogression in matters of principle or policy.

We are, then, for not at all surprised to find the bolder leaders of the tariff-smashing movement, expressing themselves with more or less reserve when asked for their opinion of the platform. The New York Herald reports the Hon. ROGER Q. MILLS as saying, "I should have drawn the platform differently had I been able to control the matter." "Perhaps," would not have drawn it that way myself," says Mr. BRICKNOR of Kentucky. "It is a matter little what its fate is," says Mr. de Meke of Arkansas, "the substance is there."

That is to say, Mr. MILLS and the statesmen of his school would have put into the platform an explicit demand for free wool, free raw material, and perhaps the retention intact of the internal revenue taxes, just as they figured in the celebrated message of last December. But Mr. MILLS and his friends did not control the matter. The platform drawn in Washington and revised and approved by Mr. CLEVELAND, received from the specific recommendation of free wool and free raw materials. It recedes from the idea that the whole hundred millions of reduction should be made in the direction of free trade.

The general endorsement of the message of December as the correct interpretation of the tariff-reduction policy of four years ago has been interpreted in a turn by no less an authority than Senator GORMAN. He does not say that the general endorsement means free wool, free raw materials, and an untouched internal revenue, but simply that it is an approval of the undeniable proposition that the Democratic party are bound, as honest men, to cut down the surplus and to reduce the war taxes one hundred million per annum or thereabouts.

In another conspicuous and notable respect the Democratic platform of 1883 is so good that it could not possibly be improved. We refer to its treatment of the question of civil service reform.

The platform disposes of civil service reform by ignoring it altogether, except in the historical sense. There is not a word of encouragement or promise for those gentlemen who have until recently cherished the belief that the Democratic party, under the present Administration, was their peculiar property and their accredited agent in the extension of the Chinese system of competitive examinations and percentage ratings. Not a word to warm the cold cookies of the most sanguine Mugwump heart! No wonder the New York Times, which Mugwumped four years ago upon this issue, pronounces the platform of 1883 utterly discreditable in its deliberate omission of any endorsement of civil service reform. That goose is cooked.

There have been educating and enlightening influences at work on the mind of the present occupant of the White House since last December; but THE SUN has no bill to render for pro-Sessional services. Our labors have been solely in the interest of genuine Democracy, and a political common sense; and the result is our sufficient reward.

last December; but THE SUN has no bill to render for pro-Sessional services. Our labors have been solely in the interest of genuine Democracy, and a political common sense; and the result is our sufficient reward.

## Tariff Education in Oregon.

The New York Times attributes the greatly increased Republican majority in Oregon to the prominence given to the tariff question during the canvass. In this the Times is undoubtedly correct. The free trade journal then proceeds to explain the failure of free trade sentiment to materialize in votes, by alleging the "uninstructed and apprehensive state of mind of the people on that question." "The fact is," continues the Times, "that education upon the real effects of the tariff has barely begun among the people of a large part of the country, and is especially backward in the remote Northwest."

So it seems. The Republican majorities for Congress in Oregon during the past twenty years have ranged from 850 up to 3,363. In five years the State has gone Democratic for Congressmen. In view of the result on Monday, the subjoined historical table of Oregon politics, in elections when a Congressman was to be chosen, becomes mightily instructive:

Majority or plurality.	
1868—Democratic.....	1.07
1870—Democratic.....	.84
1872—Republican.....	.85
1873—Democratic.....	2.07
1875—Democratic.....	.26
1876—Republican.....	1.16
1878—Democratic.....	1.15
1880—Republican.....	1.80
1882—Republican.....	.89
1884—Republican.....	2.04
1886—Republican.....	1.63